

Action Item

*California Postsecondary Education Commission*

Approval of the Minutes of the July 30-31, 2001, Meeting

---



---

# MINUTES

## *California Postsecondary Education Commission*

Meeting of July 30 and 31, 2001

---

**Commissioners  
present  
July 30, 2001**

Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*  
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*  
William D. Campbell  
Phillip J. Forhan  
Susan Hammer  
Robert A. Hanff  
Lance Izumi  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Odessa P. Johnson  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.  
Olivia K. Singh  
Howard Welinsky  
Melinda G. Wilson

**Commissioners  
absent**

Evonne Seron Schulze  
Kyhl Smeby

---

**Commissioners  
present  
July 31, 2001**

Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*  
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*  
William D. Campbell  
Phillip J. Forhan  
Robert A. Hanff  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Odessa P. Johnson  
Olivia K. Singh  
Howard Welinsky  
Melinda G. Wilson

**Commissioners  
absent**

Lance Izumi  
Evonne Seron Schulze  
Kyhl Smeby

**Commissioners  
present after call  
of the roll**

Susan Hammer  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.

---

**Call to order** Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday, July 30, 2001 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 1:13 p.m. in the conference center of Apple Computer Corporation, 4 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

<b>Call of the roll</b>	Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Smeby and Schulz.
<b>Welcome</b>	Chair Arkatov welcomed new Commissioners Odessa Johnson and William Campbell, representing the University of California and California State University systems respectively.
<b>Approval of the consent calendar</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov announced that six agenda items were on the Commission Consent Calendar for approval. There were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commission Minutes of June 4-5, 2001;</li> <li>♦ Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee Minutes of the June 4, 2001;</li> <li>♦ The Executive Compensation in California Public Higher Education, 2000 – 2001 report;</li> <li>♦ Governmental Relations Committee Minutes of the June 5, 2001;</li> <li>♦ Educational Policy and Programs Committee Minutes of the June 5, 2001; and</li> <li>♦ The Needs Analysis for Chaffey Community College Fontana Center.</li> </ul> <p>Following consultation with the commissioners, Chair Arkatov removed from the Consent Calendar both the report, Executive Compensation in California Public Higher Education, 2000 – 2001, and the Approval of the Minutes of the June 4 – 5, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>The Chair asked for a motion to adopt the remaining items on the Consent Calendar, as revised. It was so moved, seconded and approved without dissent.</p>
<b>Approval of the minutes</b>	<p>Director Fox said corrections will be made to the minutes of the July 4 – 5, 2001, meeting. Under the section, Report of the Statutory Advisory Committee, the second sentence on page 9 should read: “The University of California reported on its actions with respect to SP-1 and SP-2 as well as the Dual Admission Program which was sent to the academic senate.”</p> <p>A motion was made to adopt the minutes of the July 4-5, 2001 Commission meeting, as amended. It was moved, seconded and approved without dissent.</p>
<b>Report of the Chair</b> <i>Technology in postsecondary education</i>	Chair Arkatov explained that the Commission believed it important to obtain some insight from both the national and state perspective concerning the issues on education technology and distance education in particular. He referenced the connection established over 30 years ago between UCLA and Stanford that were the beginning of the Internet, as it is known today. He stated that dramatic changes have been occurring in the use of technology within our Colleges and Universities. He introduced David Beyer to give the Postsecondary Education Commission a view from Apple Corporation and the Web Based Education Commission.

David Beyer, senior manager for education and strategic relations at Apple Corp., said he previously served as the executive director of the Web Based Education Commission. He stated that the Web Based Education Commission was established in 1999 with the purpose of helping Congress gain an understanding of the Internet and its potential for learning at all levels. He explained that one of the goals of the Web Based Education Commission was to form a consensus document which would help Congress assess the policy ramifications of, and develop sets of recommendations for, helping learners learn through the Internet.

Mr. Beyer described the mission of the Web Based Education Commission and its early consensus on the following ideas:

- ♦ All learners have full and equal access to the capabilities of the World Wide Web.
- ♦ If all learners are going to have equal access, then the online content and learning, then strategies need to be affordable and meet the highest standards of educational quality.

Mr. Beyer stated that Art Levine from Columbia Teachers College provided data that show that the traditional 18 to 22 year old campus-based student today represents only 16 percent of all individuals who seek postsecondary education. He pointed out that institutions largely organize around this student group.

Some of the key findings put forth by the Web Based Education Commission are:

- ♦ The Internet begins to center learning around the student in ways unimaginable before.
- ♦ Access to the Internet is limited, and professional development efforts are just beginning.
- ♦ There is a problem in research and development. (What is the pedagogical framework for learning in the Internet age?)
- ♦ There is a lack of high quality online content that has a benchmark established to standards.
- ♦ Some outdated regulations discourage anytime/anywhere/anyplace learning.
- ♦ Children and older adults need protection from commercialism, the release of personally identifiable information and the harmful content that resides on the net.
- ♦ There is a major funding problem for technology in K-12 and that, on average, K-12 schools are spending between \$100 and \$200 on the education technology investment needs per pupil, but that business in America is spending upwards of \$3,500 to \$5,500 per worker per year.
- ♦ Broadband access should be the principle goal of telecommunications policy.
- ♦ Advanced training of educators and administrators is a top priority.

- ♦ There is a Federal role to help define the criteria upon which to base content that resides on the Internet and, if necessary, to provide “seed” funding in high need areas.

Mr. Beyer also reported that HR 1992 had passed one committee in Congress and that it aims to revise the rules that he believes have an unfair impact on students seeking or receiving financial aid and who want to participate in distance learning. He said the Web Based Education Commission looked at postsecondary accreditation and it asked the accreditation entities revise their business models and policies. If the power of the Internet is to be released and the potential for distance learning is to be realized, then there is a need to look at tuition policies and the way academic credit is offered. He noted that these are issues that are deeply challenged by local school boards and state lawmakers at the K-12 level.

Mr. Beyer discussed educational “safe zones” with respect to protecting users of the Internet. He stressed the need for media competency programs that are holistic and that focus on ethics, use, and responsibility. The Web Based Education Commission suggested that federal and state policy makers have an important role to ensure that policies that are put into law are also adequately funded for implementation. He stressed the need for the nation to adopt an “E-learning” agenda as a centerpiece of the country’s educational policy.

Chair Arkatov introduced Dr. Stanley Chodorow, vice president of Academic Affairs, Questia Media Inc. and former CEO of California Virtual University. Stanley Chodorow stated that, in addition to his post at Questia Media, he teaches three courses at UCSD in which he attempts to use Internet technology. He said his presentation focused on institutions, faculty, curriculum and the use of new technological opportunities that need to be overcome.

Mr. Chodorow reported that plans were made in 1990 for three new University of California campuses by a number of committees, including the Academic Support Services committee that he then chaired. The committee thought about the technology and the network as a campus based entity in which campuses could be linked by satellite. At the time, the library was the principle source of information resources for any campus. The committee recognized then that the network on the campus was going to become a medium of education, not merely a communication system. As an educational force, the Internet came into being in 1994 when the experimental online courses began to breakdown the notion of the individual institution. He said that the Internet affects various aspects of educational institutions, including institutional boundaries, the individualization of learning and expansion of curriculum, collaboration on teaching materials, new educational techniques, distance education, and institutional values

The term “education” is a catchall phrase applied to liberal arts, to professional education, residential and commuter institutions, and correspondence courses and programs. There are different quality measures, different standards, expectations and demands in each of the types of education. Education can be either faculty- or course-based. The question is whether the self-sufficient course is in fact a high quality educational enter-

prise or training. Most faculty regard education as an open-ended enterprise and the course is viewed as an entry-point to discovery, a doorway into the library or the laboratory. It is also the start of the process of learning. That distinction is a critical to understanding and evaluating the Internet as a medium of education.

Residential education involves primarily face-to-face interaction, symbolized by the liberal arts college and the ‘traditional’ student. In residential education, online content can help facilitate such personal interaction. Commuter education relates to an older segment of the population and includes both face-to-face and online contact, with the convenience of the Internet being a critical factor. Distance education involves institutions that are dedicated primarily to, as the name implies, education at a distance. Here, the question is what role, if any, of face-to-face interaction will have in distance education. Integration of at least one or two face-to-face meetings could greatly enhance an online course. Without some face-to-face contact, online education will fail, he said.

The final frontier of access from a policy point of view is whether distance or online education is good enough for those persons who cannot go to a campus or participate in face-to-face education, Mr. Chodorow said. There is prevalence in the use of online education in postgraduate programs; those who take these courses are educated already and are now being trained in some new enterprise. The two breakthrough requirements for expansion of that set of programs are student financial aid, and adequate online library.

Mr. Chodorow maintained that learning and teaching is another issue that comes up in this use of technology in education. Technology increases student-to-teacher and student-to-student communication. The premise is that one can learn from the Internet but cannot become educated from the Internet. When distance education is put in context and viewed as part of a continuum that starts with a seminar and includes instances in which student and teacher never meet face-to-face, it becomes apparent this offers a whole range of educational milieus which all have values and uses. Higher education rests on research. University faculty does not merely teach a subject, they teach what they do. Institutions that offer distance education have to be part of, not apart from, the system of higher education institutions.

---

**Recess** Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

---

**Reconvene** Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 2:53 p.m. and introduced William H. Graves, Chairman and Founder of Eduprise.

Mr. Graves stated that education is about learning and the Internet is a partnering medium in that process. Higher education had yet to take the idea of a partnership in this new medium and leverage it to do what needs to be done in higher education. He described processes and services that are part of learning process, including that student must be admitted, pay the bills, utilize the library, communicate, and receive advice. Increasingly, the demand on the student side is for these and other processes to be as convenient as possible. While, at its heart, this about learning, it is really about the

integration of all those processes around learning which leads to the anyplace/anytime concept of “E-education.”

It is possible to use this technology to create new wealth in the extended sense of wealth as it relates to education. He provided examples of creating such new wealth and new strategies, explaining that the CALSTATETEACH program was created to solve such problems as having 17,000 elementary school teachers in California teaching under emergency credentialing measures. This online program works to get the teachers credentialed in place.

Mr. Graves described the Kentucky Virtual University and its focus on access and student services as well as the University of Baltimore that has a fully online AACSB accredited MBA program that licenses its program through the virtual campuses in Kentucky. This is a new way of doing business in higher education and it is stepping across the boundaries. Very important high enrollment core courses are being put online that give students options, and frees up classroom space leveraging the strategic investments of campuses and systems in the realm of “E- education.”

The vision is one of transformation and the achievement of a greater return on investment in education by the use of technology. The Internet in this “anyplace/anytime” mode increases convenience for learners, which increases access. In relation to the pedagogy, faculty should be concerned with how to increase the quality of learning outcomes and the return on investment in education. He discussed how to achieve a strategic return on investments in higher education, and described core assets such as the authority to credential students, the faculty and intellectual capital. The input of dollars into programs tied to the educational mission, even if the ultimate goals may be different, is the first step in achieving a strategic return.

Mr. Graves discussed increased stakeholder access and satisfaction by way of a convenient, online, personalized academic and administrative service as one seamless package. This could capture the idea of a virtual university and capture the services that are on a traditional campus, supporting the traditional classroom experience. There are approximately 25 courses that most institutions have in common which account for 35 to 50 percent of total enrollment. These same courses -- which include mathematics, writing and basic chemistry -- have the most problems, such as the highest failure rates and retention problems. He said and increase investment in technology dollars would be worthwhile in improving those courses.

Mr. Graves stated that there are a number of campuses that have proved that they can offer these courses with better learning results and reduced instructional cost. From the network point-of-view, change causes a lot of human friction in that adaptation is difficult. Technology is progressing exponentially but the human capacity to comprehend and harness it to the fundamental mission of educating students is not. The Internet has the capability to reduce both cost and friction out of sharing resources and communicating with others; create and support the learning communities; made transactions for services; capitalize and operate new services; and improve partnering.

Commissioner Jhin stated that the Virtual University assumes that people know how to use a computer and have the money to buy one.



Mr. Graves agreed, noting that the State of Kentucky had invested in computers for every armory and library in the state to provide access for disadvantaged students who could not afford to buy a PC. He stated that if a student can get to a computer, online computer assistance is readily available.

Commission Vice Chair Chandler asked how to maintain the integrity of courses offered online. Mr. Graves stated that the Virtual University of Kentucky developed a model where there are testing centers across the state to proctor final exams. He added that his organization has changed testing to a continuous assessment strategy which deters cheating. If people change the way they think about assessment, what it means, and how it is practiced, the problem can be eliminated.

Commissioner Wilson inquired about the access of students with disabilities to learning opportunities in this new medium. Mr. Beyer responded that there was significant discussion by a large range of technology experts. Congress and others to ensure that content and hardware infrastructure complies with the ADA and section 508 of the rehabilitation act of 1973. Information technology providers can easily re-adapt software and configurations to meet specialized needs.

Chair Arkatov stated that new and developing technologies are, in terms of touch, hearing and sound, extraordinary and he discussed the interface with the computer. He said the key challenge is to be vigilant in terms of making sure those that need access receive it in a way that fits their learning styles.

Commissioner Wilson voiced support for a national discussion regarding ergonomics for students using the technology, particularly in K – 12. She has not heard any discussions about the health and safety for students using this technology.

Chair Arkatov stated that AB 1123 had tasked the Commission with coming back to the Legislature and the governor with recommendations regarding distance learning and the technological infrastructure.

Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Chodorow how he views community colleges moving forward in terms of distance education and technology. Mr. Chodorow responded that one of the most effective uses of Internet and Internet-based courses is the offering of remedial course work. The instruction of fundamental skills such as writing and mathematics using this technology is very effective and important to community colleges in particular. Certificate programs are found across most programmatic offerings at community colleges and universities and are well suited to “E-learning.” He stated that price would be the real driver in terms of the preponderance of online courses.

Director Fox discussed the ability of the Commission to move forward some potential proposals on professional development regarding the use of technology for teachers already teaching in classrooms that may improve some of the long list of problems in K-12.

Mr. Beyer stated that Congress is addressing professional development in the Higher Education Act under Title II (teacher quality). He stated that efforts to significantly increase resources for schools are going to take place when it is reauthorized in a couple

of years. He stated that Congress is in the middle of a debate over the *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology* program that is the only bridge program that looks at how technology can be used in training teachers who go into K-12 schools. He noted that it is a discretionary grant program that Congress will probably be reauthorizing.

Commissioner Jhin inquired about the completion rate of students using distance learning compared to traditional students. Mr. Graves responded that it varies according to how the institution supports the student.

Commissioner Hanff asked Mr. Beyer if the Web Based Education Commission had looked at the role of technology to improve online applications, financial aid, registration, and book sales. Mr. Beyer stated that, to some degree, it did but that its charge was built around the notion of how to maximize the benefit of the Internet for learning. He said the Web Based Education Commission discovered major regulatory impediments neutralized the potential for effect use of the Internet

Mr. Beyer provided an example of problems with online student aid for those learning online and suggested that student aid laws need to be reformed to prevent hampering the use of the Internet in education.

Commissioner Forhan stated the importance of faculty should not be underestimated but, concurrently, faculty represents the status quo in many areas. He said there is "friction" among faculty to move into the area of distance learning and asked how one can reconcile this juxtaposition. Mr. Chodorow responded that faculty members are conservative, and that faculty members look at their programs and say, "I'm full of students." Faculty balks at being asked to take on more students and create new courses on top of the ones they already are involved in. It is going to take time to persuade and induce faculty to behave in the certain ways that will result in great success.

Commissioner Hammer asked Mr. Beyer to quantify and characterize what kind of challenges it is to expand broadband access to all learners. Mr. Beyer stated that the Web Based Education Commission did not quantify it in dollars but the cost is of mammoth proportions.

In closing, Chair Arkatov asked what the California Virtual University "Part II" might look like. Mr. Beyer stated that everyone has already learned many lessons and that there are many lessons yet to be learned as well. He said the economic climate would cause the effort to move in a mode of "two steps forward and one step back." There is no alternative but to move forward.

Mr. Chodorow stated that if CVU was recreated and with enough time it would succeed in doing very important things for potential students in the state. Access to all of what is available online in one place, with mechanisms to encourage faculties and institutions to develop programs, would move the state ahead enormously. He added that it would need to be funded over a period of years that would give it enough time to develop.

---

**Recess** Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 4:41 p.m.

---

**Reconvene** Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 4:46 p.m. and introduced Jonathan Brown, president of AICCU and Ron Danielson, a professor from Santa Clara University.

Mr. Brown stated that the transition to the technology based education of mediated activity and full electronic education is experiencing tremendous variation by institution. Some fundamental changes in definitions are underway at all institutions, including a change in definition of what constitutes a student, faculty, degree, and courses. Higher education often finds it hard to deal with such change. He discussed three fundamental questions which State policy must address the availability of bandwidth in educational institutions, the development of course work and activities, and the fair use of material in terms of copyrights.

Mr. Ron Danielson described the opportunities for Santa Clara University to improve the learning that its students experience, to increase the effectiveness of faculty and to impact the scholarship of both students and faculty. He said:

- ◆ Educational technologies will allow student access to resources at their own pace, and access to media that is appropriate to their learning style.
- ◆ Use of educational technologies offer students opportunities to contribute in many different mediums and become more fully engaged in the range of activities going on in a classroom.
- ◆ The technology can provide students with access to information resources when they are needed.
- ◆ The restructuring of classes will facilitate the optimum use of the instructor/ student face-to-face time.

Mr. Danielson said that Santa Clara University does not plan to go fully into a distanced learning environment. He expressed the University's concern over enriching the courses that they presently offer in the traditional face-to-face environment. He listed lessons learned and observations about educational technology that include the following:

- ◆ No single solution is right for every situation.
- ◆ An absolutely reliable infrastructure is critical.
- ◆ Faculty and students both need support and encouragement.
- ◆ Be selective in choosing technologies that are to be widely implemented.
- ◆ Be sensitive to the impact of technologies on the institution's defining characteristics.

Chair Arkatov introduced three panelists: Le Baron Woodyard, dean of instructional resources and technology, California Community Colleges; David Ernst, assistant vice

chancellor for Information Technology Services, California State University, and Julius Zelmanowitz, vice provost for Academic Initiatives, University of California.

Mr. Woodyard discussed the California Community Colleges experiences in technology and distance education. The community colleges have been undertaking a series planning efforts over the last eight years that initially led to a Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program, having recently completed a two-year planning effort referred to as "Technology II." Community colleges have tried to address the issue of technology infrastructure for the system; initially partnering with the California State University to transform CSUNET to CCCCNET, a combination of community colleges and CSU.

Mr. Woodyard said CCCCNET currently connects all of the community colleges and district offices onto the same network that connects all of the California State University and that CCCCNET is the network foundation for the California Digital Project. The inclusion of K-12 systems with the CSU, UC and community colleges is a possibility and goal for the overall program. The program funding streams have been sponsored by the State but also have been supported at the local level. Bandwidth is a serious issue because of the need for more connectivity in preparation for the Internet II phase and because the technology itself doubles every 18 months. He discussed Title Wave II enrollment demands and noted that 70 percent of students that graduate from K-12 who are going on to higher education attend a community college.

Mr. Woodyard explained that the major push for technology on the campuses is not coming from distance education but from an integration of technology into traditional courses.

He noted the following points:

- ◆ Five percent of courses are offered through distance learning in the community colleges.
- ◆ There is an IT component in 60 percent of all community college courses.
- ◆ 105,000 students in the California Community College system have participated in distance education.
- ◆ Differential funding of distance education needs to be addressed.
- ◆ There needs to be access for students with disabilities.
- ◆ Total cost of ownership is \$3,506 for every computer when support components are included.
- ◆ California Community Colleges continue to receive funds to maintain 4500 courses offered on the California Virtual University network.

Chair Arkatov introduced David Ernst and Julius Zelmanowitz, both members of the AB 1123 advisory committee that has been charged by the Legislature to come back with policy on distance learning and technological infrastructure for higher education.

Mr. Ernst briefly discussed several points, including the following:

- ♦ CSU has learned that it has been important in the use of technology to have a plan, to stick to it and fund it until it is completed.
- ♦ Faculty needs incentives to look at technology as a way of enhancing what they teach and what students learn.
- ♦ Any plans made should be outcome based.

Mr. Zelmanowitz stated that the University of California approaches technology from the perspective of a research university. The opportunity to create and innovate drives faculty. Information and instructional technology has created the opportunity to be creative and innovative on the instructional side in a way that was not possible previously. The Digital California Project is a very effective collaboration between all the segments and K-12 to develop a cost-effective strategy for the State to provide broadband networking to K-12. The UC college preparation initiative that offers advanced placement courses for free to students throughout California who might otherwise have no access to AP courses. He described various University programs including UCTV, Digital Chemistry 1A at UC Berkeley, the Transpacific Interactive Distance Education, and the Global Film School.

---

**Recess** At 5:40 p.m., Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting until the following day at 8:30 a.m.

---

**Call to order** Chair Arkatov called the Tuesday July 31, 2001 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 8:45 a.m. at Apple Computer Corporation, 4 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

---

**Call of the roll** Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present, except Commissioners Izumi, Smeby, and Schulz. Commissioners Rodriguez and Hammer arrived after the call of the roll.

---

**Report of the Statutory Advisory Committee** Chair Christopher Cabaldon reported that the Statutory Advisory Committee met the week prior and noted that the segments have provided their monthly reports that included the following topics:

- ♦ CSU reported on the new presidents at Channel Island and the Maritime Academy; hiring of the new faculty and Vice President for development at Channel Islands; a new system-wide policy on alcohol; a new policy to allow students who are admitted for the fall semester to enroll in the summer as regular students and on the new Merlot catalog and E Books program.
- ♦ The University of California reported on the adoption of the Dual Admissions program with the California Community Colleges; the opening of the UC office in Mexico City; and the unveiling of the first look at the UC Merced campus at the last meeting of the Board of Regents.

- ◆ Independent colleges reported on the proposal for a new university campus in the south Placer County area of the Sacramento region.
- ◆ The California Department of Education reported on its schools and annual convention.
- ◆ The California Community Colleges reported on open recruitment for three new Vice Chancellors; progress of the common course numbering system, and the Legislature's continuing consideration of legislation that would use the California articulation number as the common course numbering system for the community colleges.

Mr. Cabaldon stated that much time was spent discussing the proposed Higher Education Facilities Bond resolution. The committee's recommendation is that the Commission should consider amending the resolution to provide for an amount of at least \$4.8 billion for the Higher Education Facilities bond. He expressed regret that the CPEC staff were not participants in the negotiation process and stated that he will make every effort to make sure that staff are full participants in negotiations on the facilities bond matter.

Commissioner Hammer asked who ultimately decides the distribution of funds to the segments. Mr. Cabaldon responded that the distribution is ultimately made by individual appropriation by the Legislature and the Governor. There is an operating agreement that the bond proceeds are to be allocated on a one-third split among the institutions.

---

**Report of the  
Executive Director**

Director Warren Fox welcomed new commissioners Johnson and Campbell and reported on two items: (1) A resolution concerning a general obligation bond for higher education; and (2) An update on the status of the Cal Grant Entitlement program. He discussed the recommendation by the systems' to increase the amount of funds needed in the resolution. The Commission recommends the bond for higher education be at least \$4 billion but that the need is likely exceed that figure. He asked the Commission to consider a change in the language in the last paragraph of the resolution to reflect the following:

"That on this day, July 31, 2001, the California Postsecondary Education Commission adopts a position of support for a bond initiative in an amount of at least \$4.8 billion dollars for higher education to be expended over the next four years, with the understanding that priorities and the distribution of funds are subject to Commission review and recommendations. Such a bond issue would provide most, but not all, of the resources needed to create new capacity to accommodate enrollment increases and to renovate existing structures to ensure their continued usefulness."

Chair Arkatov added that the California Postsecondary Education Commission is very displeased with the segments working together in closed-door sessions and in the resulting "fuzzy mathematics" on some of the issues. He stated this is why the Commission has suggested this language in terms of being able to come back to the Commission with regards to the priorities and the distribution of these funds.

After some discussion relating to the resolution language, the Field Act standards, and joint use facilities, a motion was made to adopt the bond issue resolution as amended. It was seconded and voted upon without dissent to adopt the resolution.

Director Fox contacted Wally Boeck, Executive Director of the Student Aid Commission, by way of speakerphone to discuss the status of the Cal Grant Entitlement program. He asked Postsecondary Education Commission staff member Karl Engelbach to give a short overview of some Cal Grant issues.

Mr. Engelbach said the Legislature revamped the State's Cal Grant program last year to create an entitlement program for high school graduates that meet either a 2.0 or 3.0 GPA and demonstrate financial need. Early estimates of the number of students eligible for the new awards were overstated in the first year and, as a result, the number of awards that were provided was not equal to the funds that were budgeted. All public systems should do a better job of ensuring that students complete both parts of the Cal Grant application process.

Mr. Boeck reviewed the entitlement and competitive elements of the Cal Grant program noting the following points:

- ♦ Entitlement is focused upon the graduating high school senior and 316,000 California high school students will graduate this year.
- ♦ 188,000 Federal Application for Student Aid (FAFSA) forms and 157,000 reports of individual student grade-point averages were received this year.
- ♦ 104,000 applications were accepted by the entitlement program, with 26,000 being incomplete.
- ♦ Of the remaining applicants, 34,500 exceeded the income and asset criteria established by the State.
- ♦ 43,500 high school students received Entitlement Cal Grants by March this year.
- ♦ The total award number depends on the completion and processing of incomplete applications.
- ♦ When competitive awards are added 78,295 Cal Grants will be awarded this year.

Commissioner Chandler asked Mr. Boeck if Cal Grants are applicable to technical Schools and other vocational programs. Mr. Boeck stated that Cal grants are applicable to all forms of postsecondary education, if a school participates in at least two federal Title IV aid programs and be participants in the Cal Grant program.

Mr. Boeck suggested integrating Student Aid Commission materials such as the FAFSA Video and tip sheet into a simple curriculum to be part of the checklist economics course every senior in high school is required to take before graduating. He said if this were accomplished, along with the automation of grade point averaging, the student aid application problem would be solved.

Commissioner Jhin asked Mr. Boeck if the video and tip sheet is available on the Student Aid Commission website [www.csac.ca.gov](http://www.csac.ca.gov). Mr. Boeck said the tip sheet is available on the website and the video will be made available to every high school in the State.

---

**Recess** Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 9:49 a.m. in order to take a break.

---

**Reconvene** Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 9:55 a.m. and introduced Kenneth C. Green, founder and director of the Campus Computing Project.

Mr. Green said his presentation included observations of how we got to where we are in our great aspirations involving technology in the educational community, the data that facilitates an understanding of the national picture by sectors, and campus planning and policy issues. The experience with technology in higher education was an accidental revolution, an unplanned event with an unprepared infrastructure. The institutions were largely reactive. The rhetorical question is: What has changed in 20 years? He said, looking broadly at education across the last 20 to 30 years, one finds issues like access, lifelong learning, and information technology.

In California, Mr. Green said these factors have come together into a tsunami of enrollment demand, driven by demographics and labor-market issues. The educational community is caught up with issues regarding the vision of higher education. He described living in “high-touch” and “high-tech” environments as well as the need to combine elements of both. He discussed information technology and the instructional mission in terms of content, context and certification.

Mr. Green explained the relationship and impact of technology in four areas: content, distribution, infrastructure, and outcomes. He presented disaggregated data by types of institution in the 13 areas: single-most-important information technology; issue-strategic information technology issues; fall 2000 Full-Time-Equivalent user support ratios; what is wired; rising use of information technology in instruction, electronic mail, World Wide Web pages for college courses, website services, Internet Service Provider services for students, strategic and financial planning, 2000; rating the campus infrastructure; intellectual property issues; and faculty support and recognition.

Mr. Green described some myths and misunderstandings relating to planning and policy issues, including:

- ♦ Clicks do not replace bricks, but they compliment each other.
- ♦ Content is not king; it is the infrastructure that is critical.
- ♦ Technology does not necessarily foster instructional and institutional productivity.

He also said distance learning is not easy, inexpensive or profitable and he discussed continuing challenges in the following areas: instructional integration and user support assessment, information technology access and Internet Service Provider services, reward and recognition infrastructure, strategic and financial planning, multiple dimensions of the “Digital divide,” and non-bundled educational opportunities.



Mr. Green presented issues seeking resolutions and provided details on: the exploding demand for distance and distributed learning; new providers and competitors; angry consumers, parents and corporate sponsors; e-commerce and e-service assessment and outcomes. He described what it is like for a faculty member to visualize using technology and how the infrastructure makes that possible. He stated that productivity occurs under three matrixes:

- ♦ The price goes down and the quality remains constant.
- ♦ The quality goes up and the price remains constant.
- ♦ The price goes down and the quality goes up.

Mr. Green commented on the distance-learning conundrum and touched upon the following points: institutional mission and mandate vs. markets, non-bundled services, overhead and development costs, “appropriate” technology, and infrastructure reimbursement vs. revenue and profits.

Mr. Green briefly discussed assessment and State policy and planning issues. He stressed the importance of sustained funding and said technology is not a capital cost, it is an operating cost. The State should think of its relationship with the elementary and secondary schools and with public postsecondary education. He recommended refraining from using bond money to buy computers because a 20-year bond for a three-year box is not a good investment. The State might want to look at Cartel development and institutional subsidy and reimbursement. In conclusion, he recommended planning through a technology triage model that includes needs, objectives and goals, because the environment is always changing.

Director Fox stated that he appreciated Mr. Green’s comments regarding the need to be attentive to the mission of the campus or system to then determine what technology can help. Sometimes the technology could be simple rather than complex and expensive.

Chair Arkatov asked Mr. Green to look ahead five years and comment upon what the State of California should be doing in terms of overall direction for the public segments.

Mr. Green stated that he firmly believes that the conversation about technology in education needs to change. Technology is not a capital investment but an operating cost. It is an investment in human capital development and the economic development of the State in terms of creating an infrastructure for faculty and providing an infrastructure for students that allows them to build their own technology portfolios. The technology requirement has not been one that college students need for jobs when they graduate; it is one that they need to get through their first course in their freshman year. Investment in infrastructure and the commitment of funding to support that infrastructure is critical to the State. If the State invested in professional development it would realize enormous dividends, Green said.

Commissioner Forhan asked Mr. Green about his thoughts on the University of Phoenix model. Mr. Green responded that Phoenix built its reputation on the performance of its students in the workplace. He said the University of Phoenix would meet some market-

place needs and that it represents the evolution of postsecondary education in the United States.

---

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 12:27 p.m.
---------------	--

---

<b>Reconvene</b>	Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education Commission on July 31, 2001 at 12:59 p.m.
------------------	---

---

<b>Report of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee</b>	Commissioner Forhan moved to accept the report entitled <i>Executive Compensation in California Public Higher Education, 2000-2001</i> . It was moved, seconded and approved without dissent to adopt the report.
---	---

---

<b>Report of the Governmental Relations Committee</b>	It was moved, seconded and approved without dissent to adopt the staff report entitled <i>Legislative and Budget Update: July 2001</i> .
---	--

---

<b>Report of the Executive Committee and the Committee on the Education Code Section 66905</b>	<p>Commissioner Rodriguez provided a report on the initiation of a process to help the Commission better evaluate itself and the Executive Director. He said Jerry Hayward, a consultant, was engaged to support this effort. At the last meeting a discussion was held with respect to the action plans to be undertaken. Two different paths were the result of Mr. Hayward's efforts. First, since there was a significant change over in terms of new Commissioners, it was important for the Commission itself to clarify its mission, agenda and priorities. To that effect the Commission will hold a retreat with Vice Chair Chandler having agreed to chair that process in order to refocus on the mission and priorities, as well as responsibilities as board members.</p> <p>The second item would be the process by which to evaluate the Executive Director. This would entail short-term objectives that the Commission would want the Director to achieve and the long-term Commission goals and objectives. A series of specific items were arrived at that are short-term and will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Director. Among these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>♦ Communications with the Commission in terms of mailing of information and dispensing information on what the Director's activities are.</li><li>♦ How the Director manages the staff with the budget in place.</li><li>♦ Discussion around regular scheduled meetings.</li></ul> <p>Commissioner Rodriguez said other items discussed were the need for the Executive Committee to meet more often. A decision was made that, after every standing meeting of the Commission, the Executive Committee would convene to continue that important dialogue rather than convening only on a once-a-year basis. There should also be Commission communication with respect to ensuring that there is a greater participation</p>
--	---

and level of expectation in terms of staff supporting Commission, committee chairs, and keeping everyone updated on the various aspects of all the issues in which the Commission is engaged.

The Commissioners were asked to attend the retreat and to provide input in the first part of November.

A motion was made to adopt the report of the Executive Committee. It was moved, seconded and approved without dissent.

An announcement was made that the California Endowment will underwrite the Commission's trip to Mexico.

---

**Adjournment**    Hearing no public comment and having no further business Chair Arkatov adjourned the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

---

---